

Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission held a meeting on Monday, June 20, 2011 scheduled for 7:00 PM at the Westfield City Hall.

Opening of Meeting: 7:00 PM

Roll Call: Note Presence of a Quorum

Commission Members Present: Robert Smith, Cindy Spoljaric, Bill Sanders, Pete Emigh, Robert Horkay, Steve Hoover, Bob Spraetz, and Danielle Tolan.

City Staff Present: Matt Skelton, Director; Kevin Todd, Senior Planner; Jennifer Miller, Senior Planner; and Brian Zaiger, City Attorney

Approval of the Minutes:

Motion to approve the June 6, 2011 minutes as presented.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Spraetz; Vote: Passed by Voice Vote

Todd reviewed the Advisory Plan Commission Rules of Procedure

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Case No.	1101-PUD-02
Petitioner	Wilfong Land Companies, LLC
Description	Springmill Trails PUD
	SR 32 & Casey Road; Petitioner requests a change in zoning of approximately 897 acres from the Eagletown PUD to the Springmill Trails PUD.

Todd stated that the petitioner is requesting suspension of rules in order to extend the period of time in which a project can be in the APC process. He noted that the rules state that a project can only be continued to a date six (6) months beyond its public hearing date. He stated that this petition received its public hearing on January 4, 2011. He further added that the petitioner was requesting to extend this rule by an additional three (3) months, making the last time the APC could review and act on this item is at its October 3, 2011 meeting. He added that the petitioner is working with staff to revise the ordinance and to address items raised at the public hearing. He also stated that staff is anticipating this petition to be back before the Commission in July.

Motion to approve the request for suspension of the rules for 1101-PUD-02.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Horkay; Vote: 8-0

Case No.	1106-REZ-02
Petitioner	M & I Bank
Description	16201 Springmill Road
	M&I Bank requests a change in zoning from the AG-SF1 District to the GB District on approximately 1.8 acres.

1
2 Todd reviewed the petition, stating that the petitioner had submitted revisions and draft written
3 commitments addressing items raised at the public hearing. The items addressed included: limiting the
4 permitted uses on the property; the building's architecture, the northern buffer yard's landscaping; and
5 vehicular access to the site.
6

7 Zaiger commented regarding the site access commitment. He stated that there were some questions raised
8 about access to Springmill Road being in close proximity to one already located just south of the subject
9 property. He stated that the petitioner has committed to one access on Springmill Road between 161st
10 Street and the northern border of the subject property. He further added that if the current access point is
11 deemed inadequate, then it will be closed and one will be opened on the subject property to serve the bank
12 property and the center. He reiterated that there will only be one road cut on Springmill Road.
13

14 Todd mentioned an additional commitment, stating that drive through windows will be located on the east
15 side of the building.
16

17 Mr. Ken Hall, M&I Bank, discussed changes to the proposed list of permitted land uses. He mentioned
18 that the landscaping to the north has been enhanced on the concept plan. He further added that there is a
19 clear understanding that there will only be one access from Springmill Road between 161st Street and the
20 northern boundary of the bank property.
21

22 Hoover stated that he prefers no direct access to Springmill Road for the bank.
23

24 Zaiger responded that there is currently a road cut on Springmill Road. He added that the preference is
25 that there be no direct access from Springmill Road. He stated that if the petitioner can get access to
26 another entrance, they will abandon the existing road cut.
27

28 Sanders stated that he believes the permitted uses should be more restricted.
29

30 Spoljaric asked how high the mounding is in the north buffer yard.
31

32 Mr. Tim Ollmann, M&I Bank, responded that the mounding will be determined during the design phase
33 to prevent any light reflection at night. He estimated that the mound would probably be no less than 3-4
34 feet high.
35

36 Spoljaric requested that these details be specified on the landscape plan.
37

38 Ollmann responded that rather than establish a minimum height at this point in the process, language
39 could be added to the written commitments to state that the north buffer would screen from light
40 pollution.
41

42 Spoljaric stated that she previously requested the building be more residential in character and is not
43 seeing this at all in the recent submittal. She stated that she believes this design is a poor fit for this
44 community.
45

46 Ollmann responded that they understand the request, but noted that it is difficult to address all of the
47 design issues with such a short time line. He mentioned, however, that they are committed to change the
48 building elevations for the next APC meeting, and asked that this item be continued to the July 5, 2011
49 meeting.
50

1 Smith asked what type of time line is necessary for design changes.

2
3 Ollmann responded that they could have something ready in two weeks.

4
5 The Commission had several suggestions for a “residential” look including, less glass and more brick and
6 pitched roofs rather than flat roofs.

7
8 Hoover requested the veterinarian use be removed from the use list.

9
10 1106-REZ-02 will be continued to the July 5, 2011 APC meeting.

11
12
13 Case No. 1106-CPA-01

14 Petitioner City of Westfield

15 Description Westfield Thoroughfare Plan Amendment

16 Petitioner requests approval of an amendment to the Westfield Thoroughfare Plan, a part
17 of the Westfield-Washington Township Comprehensive Plan.

18
19 Miller reviewed the amendment and the two issues identified at the public hearing. She stated that the
20 first issue was the revision to the Westfield Park Drive/Wheeler Road connection. She stated that the
21 revision has been made to be consistent with the State’s plan for this area. She stated that the second
22 issue was the connection of Oak Ridge through Grand Park. She stated that the County thoroughfare plan
23 shows Oak Ridge ending just outside Washington Township, at 236th Street. She further reported the
24 Grand Park Design and Engineering Team’s recommendation to remove Oak Ridge through the Park to
25 reduce potential vehicle and pedestrian conflicts is the reasoning behind removing the proposed extension
26 of Oak Ridge from the Westfield Thoroughfare Plan.

27
28 Sanders stated that he would like to Wheeler extend to the new frontage road along the west side of U.S.
29 31 rather than extend to Tomlinson Road.

30
31 Motion to approve 1106-CPA-01 as presented.

32
33 Motion: Horkay; Second: Emigh; Vote: 8-0

34
35
36
37 **ADJOURNMENT** (7:50 p.m.)

38
39 Approved (date)

40
41 _____
42 President, Robert Smith, Esq.

43
44 _____
45 Vice President, Cindy Spoljaric

46
47 _____
48 Secretary, Matthew S. Skelton, Esq.